

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

REC'D 26 JUL 2005

WIPO

PCT

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/IB2005/050091

International filing date (day/month/year)
07.01.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)
19.01.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
G11B20/00, G11B20/14, H03M5/14

Applicant
KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☒ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☒ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☒ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for International preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Sucher, R

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-2148



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2005/050091

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2005/050091

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

- ☐ the entire international application,
- ☒ claims Nos. 2-10,13-15

because:

- ☐ the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):
- ☒ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. 1,11,12,16-18 are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

see separate sheet

- ☐ the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.
- ☐ no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos.
- ☐ the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:
 - the written form ☐ has not been furnished
 - ☐ does not comply with the standard
 - the computer readable form ☐ has not been furnished
 - ☐ does not comply with the standard
- ☐ the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.
- ☐ See separate sheet for further details

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/B2005/050091

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1,11,12,16-18
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1,11,12,16-18
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1,11,12,16-18
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

see separate sheet

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

Re Item III

Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

Since the independent claims 1 and 12 are not clear (see section V below), no meaningful opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability of dependent claims 2-10 and 1-15 could be formed.

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Reference is made to the following document:

D1: WO 02/11136 A (MACROVISION EUROPE LIMITED; HEYLEN, RICHARD, A., A) 7 February 2002.

2. Claim 1 defines a device for embedding a secondary information signal in a channel data stream of an encoded primary information signal, which uses "freedoms in the DC control" and makes "non-optimal, arbitrary or random choices of the DC control at a number of locations of the channel data stream" for embedding the secondary information signal. From this definition, it not clear how the secondary information signal is to be embedded (Article 6 PCT). In particular, it is unclear whether the secondary information is encoded by the location where the DC control is "non-optimal, arbitrary or random" or by the difference to an "optimal" DC control (which itself may be ambiguous). Claim 12 defines a device for extracting a secondary information signal from a channel data stream of an encoded primary information signal, which uses "location information specifying the location of the secondary information signal in the channel data stream", but also fails to define how the secondary information signal is extracted from the detected DC control information.

Without an appropriate clarification, the subject-matter of claims 1 and 12 is not new

in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT, because document D1 readily shows (see in particular p.13, l. 1 - p. 16, l. 27) a device for embedding/extracting a secondary information signal ("authenticating signature") in/from a channel data stream of an encoded primary information signal (e.g. EFM signal of a CD), which makes non-optimal choices of the DC control (choosing data patterns which cause DSV problems) at a number of locations of the channel data stream (information as to the existence and location of the data patterns is provided in the primary volume descriptor of the CD) for embedding the secondary information signal.

The same objections also apply to claims 11 and 16 defining the corresponding method for embedding/extracting a secondary information signal and to claims 17 and 18 defining the corresponding computer program and record carrier, respectively.

Re Item VII

Certain defects in the international application

1. Contrary to the requirements of Rule 5.1(a)(ii) PCT, the relevant background art disclosed in document D1 is not mentioned in the description, nor is this document identified therein.
2. The independent claims are not in the two-part form in accordance with Rule 6.3(b) PCT, which in the present case would be appropriate, with those features known in combination from the prior art (document D1) being placed in a preamble and with the remaining features being included in a characterising part.

Re Item VIII

Certain observations on the international application

see section V above.